



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,426	05/10/2001	Takeshi Kobayashi	P/1139-101	6776
7590 05/02/2008				
STEVEN I. WEISBURD DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO, MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP 1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS 41ST FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714				
EXAMINER				
TRAN, TUAN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853,426

Applicant(s)

KOBAYASHI, TAKESHI

Examiner

TUAN A. TRAN

Art Unit

2618

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-15 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/IC)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 10-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suso et al. (6,466,202) in view of Narayanaswamy et al. (6,144,358).

Regarding claims 10 and 12, Suso discloses a folding portable communication unit (See figs. 1a-1d) which is composed of first and second cabinets 1, 2 and a hinge 5, 6, 7 for so supporting the first and second cabinets 1, 2 that they are rotational around the hinge 5, 6, 7 (See fig. 1d) comprising: first display/data-input means 11, 12a, 13a, 14a which displays a first information related to mobile telephone communication, inputs a first data related to the communication, and is situated on an obverse surface of the first and second cabinets 1, 2; second display/data-input means 10, 12b, 13b, 14b which displays a second information related to mobile telephone communication, inputs a second data related to the communication, and is situated on a rear cover of the first or second cabinets 1, 2, wherein the second information can be watched and the second data can be inputted by a user in case that the first and second cabinets 1, 2 are folded; and a control unit (CPU), via display driver, operable to control which of the first display and the second display is to be used (See col. 5 lines 13-46, col. 7 lines 1-5); wherein the folding portable communication unit being operable to permit verbal telephone

telecommunication only in case that the first and second cabinets 1, 2 are in an open position (See figs. 1a-1d, 2a-2b, 3a and col. 4 line 5 to col. 5 line 9, col. 6 lines 21-52, col. 7 lines 19-47). However, Suso does not mention that the communication unit comprises a common display driver operable to drive both the first and second displays as well as to decide which of the first and second displays is to be used based on a kind of the input information. Narayanaswami teaches a folding portable communication unit, wherein the communication unit comprises a common display driver operable to drive multiple displays as well as to decide which of the multiple displays is to be used based on a kind of the input information (See fig. 2 and col. 3 lines 19-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the communication unit as disclosed by Suso with the display driver taught by Narayanaswami for the advantage of reducing the number of electronic components of the communication unit as well as reducing power consumption, cost, size of the communication unit.

Regarding claims 11, 13 and 14-15, Suso and Narayanaswami disclose as cited in claim 10. Suso further discloses the control unit comprises a means for detecting whether or not the first cabinet and the second cabinet are folded, and is operable to control the display driver to display on the first display or the second display various information (data inputted from the keys or keypad and input information including pictorial information) depending on a result of detection performed by the detecting means (See col. 4 lines 45-55, col. 5 lines 13-26, col. 6 lines 31-40, see fig. 3a and col. 7 lines 1-5 and see fig. 3b and col. 5 lines 13-25, col. 6 lines 31-40, col. 7 lines 48-52).